

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/977,664	10/15/2001	Robert D. Herpst	3468	
26009 75	590 10/26/2006	EXAMINER		
ROGER M. RATHBUN 13 MARGARITA COURT HILTON HEAD ISLAND, SC 29926			ALEXANDER, LYLE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1743	
			DATE MAILED: 10/26/2006	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/977,664	HERPST, ROBERT	Г D.		
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Lyle A. Alexander	1743			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence add	dress		
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE in a solution of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MC cause the application to become	IICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this col ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133)	·		
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Au	ugust 2006.				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-20, 28,30-33,35-37 and 30-53</u> 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-20, 28,30-33,35-37 and 30-53</u> is/are Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration. e rejected.	pplication.			
Applicati	on Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Examine	-				
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce		hy the Examiner			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti			R 1.121(d).		
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in a ity documents have been (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National S	Stage		
Attachment	(s)					
1) Notice 2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application			

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-20, 28,30-33,35-37 and 30-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claims state the "solid, non-porous sample supporting substrate". However, the specification does not teach the claimed "solid, non-porous sample supporting substrate".

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-20, 28,30-33,35-37 and 30-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are vague and indefinite what is intended by "solid, non-porous sample supporting substrate". It is not known what type of substrate is intended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim 1-20, 28,30-33,35-37,30-44 and 46-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Gagnon et al. (USP 5,764,355) in view of Eden et al. (USP 4,843,030), further in view of Applicants' admitted prior art (pages 3-8 of the original specification) or Izumi (USP 4,932,780).

See the appropriate paragraph of the 5/11/06 Office action.

Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gagnon et al. (USP 5,764,355) in view of Eden et al., further in view of Applicants' admitted prior art (pages 3-8 of the original specification) or Izumi (USP 4,932,780) together further in view of Marker et al. (4,855,110).

See the appropriate paragraph of the 5/11/06 Office action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/14/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' amendments deleting the language "has not been optically polished" has obviated the 5/11/06 35 USC 112 1st and 2nd paragraph rejections. However, the new claim language "solid, non-porous" has raised new 35 USC 112 1st and 2nd paragraph issues as elaborated above.

Applicants' state the "Examiner has not given any weigh" to the commercial success arguments. The Office has stated the 2/27/06 and 12/2/05 Affidavits are not sufficient to show commercial success of the instant invention as required by MPEP section 716.01.

Application/Control Number: 09/977,664

Art Unit: 1743

Applicants' argue the Examiner is being placing too high a bar for Applicants' to show commercial success. The Office is constrained by the requirements set forth in MPEP section 716.01. Applicants' are encouraged follow the guidelines set forth by the MPEP to convincingly show commercial success.

Applicants' state new claim language "solid, non-porous" is supported by the original specification disclosure of a crystal. The Office does not understand how the instant claim language "solid, non-porous" is supported by the taught crystal structure.

Applicants' state on page 19 in the second full paragraph, the Office has relied on the first embodiment taught by Gagnon et al. Applicants' state the instant invention is created by very specific production steps. These remarks are not commensurate in scope with the instant claims as none of these steps are claimed. Also, Applicants' remarks that Gagnon et al. do not teach "solid, non-porous sample supporting substrate" are not commensurate in scope as these limitations appear to be new matter (see the above 35 USC 112 1st paragraph rejections).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lyle A Alexander whose telephone number is 571-272-1254. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Wednesday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lyle A Alexander Primary Examiner Art Unit 1743